



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/783,522

02/20/2004

Roy Lurie

MWS-109RCE

7481

74321

7590

05/28/2008

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP/THE MATHWORKS

One Post Office Square

Boston, MA 02109-2127

EXAMINER

WHALEY, PABLO S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1631

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/783,522	Applicant(s) LURIE ET AL.	
	Examiner PABLO WHALEY	Art Unit 1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) PABLO WHALEY.

(3) MIKE BADZINSKI (APPL. REPR.).

(2) EUIHOON LEE (APPL. REPR.).

(4) KEVIN CANNING (APPL. REPR.).

Date of Interview: 23 May 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Potts and Bubendorf.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed proposed amendment submitted by applicant. Discussed 101 issues directed to tangible results for programs and computer-readable media (claim 1) and non-functional versus function descriptive subject matter. Applicant's argued that the prior art did not teach automated gathering of data from an in-situ experimental device.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Pablo S. Whaley/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1631

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required